

REMARKS

This is in response to the Office Action mailed June 29, 2007. The specification has been amended in accordance with the objections set forth in the Office Action. The specification has also been amended to include the correct full application number of a co-pending PCT patent application. Applicants have not amended the specification to include section headings, but would do so if so requested.

Claims 14, 16, 21, and 22 are currently amended. Support for currently amended claim 14 can be found throughout the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, at page 8, lines 12-14, and page 12, lines 15-20. Support for currently amended claim 16 can be found, for example, at page 13, lines 28-30 of the specification as originally filed. Support for currently amended claim 21 can be found for example, at page 6, lines 26-28. Support for currently amended claim 22 can be found throughout the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 7, lines 1-3. Claims 32 and 33 are new. Support for new claims 32 and 33 can be found in the specification and claims as originally filed, for example, in original claim 14. Claims 1-22 and 24-33 will be pending upon entry of the instant amendment.

No new matter has been added. Amendments to the claims should in no way be construed as an acquiescence to any of the Office Action's objections and/or rejections. Amendments to the claims are being made solely to expedite prosecution of the above-identified application. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute the same or similar claims in the present or another patent application. The amendments made are not related to any issues of patentability.

Objections to the Specification

Drawings

The Office Action has objected to the drawings as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5), because they do not include a reference sign to the “ends **3**,” as recited on p. 8, line 25 of the specification as originally filed. Applicants submit that the number “3” was inadvertently included, and have deleted it from the specification. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this objection.

Specification

The Office Action has objected to the specification for a number of informalities. Specifically, the Office Action objected to the references to claim numbers throughout the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that these references have been deleted, thereby rendering this objection moot. The Office Action has also objected to the recitation “...onto a, here...” on page 8, line 2 of the specification as originally filed. This recitation has been re-worded accordingly, thereby rendering this objection moot. The Office Action states that consistent terminology should be used for “broad edge strip 14” (page 8, line 25), and “flat edge strip 14” (page 8, line 27). Solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended the specification accordingly, *i.e.*, to refer to an “edge strip.” Applicants thereby respectfully request withdrawal of this objection. The Office Action has also objected to the recitation of the attorney’s reference number throughout the specification as originally filed. Applicants respectfully submit that these recitations have been deleted, thereby rendering this objection moot.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112 Second Paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 14-22 and 24-31 under § 112 ¶ 2 as indefinite.

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. With respect to claim 14, the Office Action states that the recitation “wherein insertion pockets, holding strips or other attachment means” is indefinite, and that the phrase “other attachment means” is vague. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 14 to refer to “attachment means.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action also states that the recitation “but without attachment means for a mop holder” in claim 14 is a negative limitation rendering the claim indefinite. In accordance with MPEP §2173.05(i), Applicants respectfully submit that “there is nothing inherently ambiguous or uncertain about a negative limitation.” However, solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 14 to claim this feature positively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action states that the recitation “first and second backing textiles are separate parts, but fixedly connected to each other or are formed as a unitary enlarged backing textile” renders claim 14 vague and indefinite. Solely in order to expedite prosecution, this recitation has been removed from claim 14. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to claim 16, the Office Action states that it is unclear what the recitation “or otherwise not liquid transporting separating section” means. Applicants respectfully disagree with this rejection. However, in order to expedite prosecution, claim 16 has been amended to remove this phrase. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action has rejected claim 21 for lacking proper antecedent basis. With respect to claim 22, the Office Action states that the recitation “is made from or specifically constructed” is awkward. Solely in order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 21 and 22 accordingly. Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The Office Action has rejected claim 25 as indefinite for containing a negative limitation. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. MPEP §2173.05(i) states that “there is nothing inherently ambiguous or uncertain about a negative limitation. So long as the boundaries of the patent protection sought are set forth definitely, albeit negatively, the claim complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.” Applicants respectfully submit that the feature “not hemmed” as recited in claim 25, does not render the claim indefinite. One of skill in the art would understand the boundaries of the patent protection sought, *i.e.*, an exemplary embodiment of the mop cover of the present invention wherein the edges of the mop cover have not been hemmed. Further, this feature is described in the specification as originally filed, for example, at page 9, lines 34-36. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of this rejection.

Summary

It is respectfully submitted that each of the pending claims is in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is kindly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' primary attorney-of-record, Anneliese S. Mayer, at (651) 795-5661, if it is believed that prosecution of this application may be assisted thereby.



Respectfully submitted,

ECOLAB INC.
Law Department
Mail Stop ESC-F7
655 Lone Oak Drive
Eagan, Minnesota 55121
Phone Number: (651) 795-5661
Fax Number: (651) 204-7507

Dated: September 21, 2007

By: /Anneliese S. Mayer/
Name: Anneliese S. Mayer
Reg. No. 54,434